

RELATION BETWEEN A CHILD'S FREEDOM FOR PERSONAL  
DEVELOPMENT IN THE HOME AND HIS SOCIAL  
SUCCESS IN SCHOOL

4/12  
APPROVED:

Marl C. Bonney  
Major Professor

J. C. Matthews  
Minor Professor

B. A. O'Hara  
Director of the Department of Education

L. A. Sharp  
Chairman of the Graduate Council

RELATION BETWEEN A CHILD'S FREEDOM FOR PERSONAL  
DEVELOPMENT IN THE HOME AND HIS SOCIAL  
SUCCESS IN SCHOOL

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North  
Texas State Teachers College in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Bess Reddell Wilkins, B. S.

Denton, Texas

June, 1941

90540

90540

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study	
Method of Approach	
Organization of Study	
II. A REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON INDEPENDENCE IN THE HOME AND SOCIABILITY IN THE SCHOOL . . . . .	4
Independence and Sociability	
Related Studies	
III. ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT BEHAVIOR AMONG THE FIRST-GRADE CHILDREN IN THEIR HOME ENVIRONMENT AND OF THEIR SOCIAL SUCCESS IN SCHOOL SITUATIONS . . . . .	24
Independence in the Home	
Home Duties and Responsibilities	
Parents' Attitudes Toward Independence	
Quartiles of Independent Behavior	
Social Success in School	
Summary	
IV. INDEPENDENCE, INTELLIGENCE, AND SOCIAL STATUS . . . . .	48
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	51
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	54

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number and Per Cent of the Fifty First-Grade Pupils Who Were Permitted to Practice Certain Traits of Independence, According to Parents' Answers to Certain Questions . . . . .	28
2. Duties and Responsibilities Assumed by the Fifty First-Grade Children in Their Homes, as Indicated in Interviews with Their Parents . . . . .	31
3. Physical and Esthetic Abilities of the Fifty First-Grade Children, as Indicated in Interviews with Their Parents . . . . .	33
4. Parents' Attitudes Toward Certain Factors Related to Their Children's Independent Behavior, as Determined by Interview . .	36
5. Number and Per Cent of Twenty-six Situations in Which Each First-Grade Pupil Possessed or Lacked Independent Behavior in His Home . . . . .	39
6. Social Success of First-Grade Pupils in School Situations, Indicated by Pupil Choices for Positions of Social Responsibility, and Arranged in Descending Order . . . .	44
7. Relationship Between the Pupils' Independence Scores, Intelligence Scores, and Social Status Scores as Shown by a Comparison of the Personnel of the Quartiles . . . .	48

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

#### Purpose of the Study

The study that is being reported in these pages is the result of an investigation among first-grade pupils in the Sam Houston School, Denton, Texas, for the purpose of ascertaining whether any relationship existed between the degree of independence that an individual child was permitted to exercise in his home and the extent to which he exhibited socialized behavior in school.

#### Method of Approach

The writer obtained much of her data by means of a personal interview with the parents or guardians of every child in her first-grade group. The parents were asked a number of questions which had been designed in such a way as to reveal pertinent facts regarding the parental attitudes toward child discipline, freedom, initiative, and independence; and to indicate the various abilities of the children involved and their duties and responsibilities in the family and home environment. (The questions used in the personal interviews are included in the stubs of Tables 1-4.)

The questions were framed purposefully in such a manner that they might be answered by the parents with a simple "yes" or "no." The answers were systematically tabulated for each child and will appear in table form later in this study.

Following the collection of data from the parents relative to the independence of the children in their homes, an investigation was carried on which would give an insight into the children's social success in school situations. To accomplish this purpose, a record was kept of each individual child's popularity in being chosen by his fellows as play-leader, room dentist, room nurse, birthday king, birthday queen, etc. It was believed that information on these points would serve to indicate each child's popularity and his social success in situations involving his school fellows. The data were compiled and tabulated and will appear in table form later in this study.

### Organization of Study

Believing that the findings of educators would be of value in developing a study of this type, the writer made a survey of literature on the relationship of a child's independence in the home to his social success in school. A summary of this material appears in Chapter II, together with a brief discussion of previous studies that are somewhat closely related to the present investigation.

Chapter III presents the findings obtained by means of

the parents' questionnaire, and indicates the status of the children's independence in their home and family life. Fifty children, for whom complete records were available, were used in the independence survey, but it was possible to use only twenty-one in connection with the study of social success.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of relationships between independence, intelligence, and social status, and shows correlations between these three factors.

The final chapter is devoted to conclusions and recommendations that appear to be logical outgrowths of this investigation.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON INDEPENDENCE IN THE HOME AND SOCIABILITY IN THE SCHOOL

#### Independence and Sociability

The privilege of personal independence necessarily implies the existence of democratic principles and a recognition of the worth and ability of the individual personality. Without these essential conditions, independence cannot be maintained. The home as an organized institution is the first social group in which the young child finds himself, and the first one to assist in shaping his personality, his attitudes, and his demeanor. By the time he has become partially adjusted to his home situation, the child is placed in another intimate social group, the school, where he must learn to respond to different stimuli. But he is still, at the same time, a member of his home group, and inevitably the influences of the home and of the school are interwoven and interdependent.

Ellenwood asks whether the function of the home is to develop discipline, to teach politeness, to please the neighbors, or to be an example of obedience and order, and then



dismisses all these queries by answering his own question thus: "Of course not. A home is a place to grow up in and to have fun in and to develop in."<sup>1</sup>

If this concept of the home and of its function is legitimate, parents must be willing to "liberate the child and guide him to a fuller challenge, thought, inquiry, and expression"<sup>2</sup> if they are to entertain hope that the child will put his own powers and resources to work through the medium of meaningful activities so as ultimately to accomplish worthwhile ends by the use of knowledge, skills, and techniques.

A wide difference exists between that type of parental tyranny which demands blind obedience on the part of the child, and the wise, directing authority which endeavors to teach him to think intelligently along constructive lines. There is an equally pronounced divergence between the policy of allowing the child to indulge every whim and impulse without any restraint whatever, and that of developing in the child a realization that other persons all about him possess certain rights and privileges that he must respect. In connection with the development of this important concept should come the child's willingness to yield to the more mature judgment and wider experience of those in control

---

<sup>1</sup>James Lee Ellenwood, "Are You a Dictator?," Parents Magazine, XIII (November, 1938), 16.

<sup>2</sup>Laura Zirbes, "What Is Freedom in the Classroom?," Progressive Education, XI (November, 1934), 385.

over him. Parents who allow their child to be a nuisance to themselves and to others, or who, in order to avoid "breaking his spirit," give sugar-coated commands that are merely weak pleas for obedience, are being as unjust as though they arbitrarily insisted on immediate response to the "because-I-said-so" technique.<sup>3</sup>

As against rigidity and fear in some homes, we find chaos and spoiled children in others. With the determination not to be a tyrant we run the danger of establishing no order, no system. . . . Like any other society, order and procedure are required at home. To achieve them by mechanical regimentation and rigid discipline is to defeat the purpose for which good homes operate. But to be so free as to encourage chaos is, likewise, to spoil people.<sup>4</sup>

It is necessary for parents to build a relation of mutual confidence from the very beginning if they are to be the advisers and helpers of their children when they arrive at the period of adolescence, with its more serious temptations and difficulties.<sup>5</sup> The attitudes of some parents to the contrary notwithstanding, this essential mutual confidence is not to be realized by surrounding the child completely with understanding and protection, and by extending these influences to all of his contacts in the outside world in an effort to make the child's discipline and behavior consistent. In school, in play, and in his wider social relationships, the child will develop a more wholesome personality

---

<sup>3</sup>June S. Larsen, "How Much Obedience?," Parents Magazine, X (April, 1935), 15.

<sup>4</sup>Ellenwood, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup>Larsen, p. 69.

if he is allowed independence, which, of course, does not mean indifference on the part of the parents as to what he is doing in his various situations. By coming in contact with different situations and standards, the child learns to make adjustments to ways other than his own and to people other than himself. This diversity of stimuli is a vital part of the educative process, and parents are unwise in trying to develop consistency of behavior where none is possible. Those parents are wiser who take time to interpret the inconsistencies to the child and to explain the necessity for them. Such a method will give the child the feeling that he is free to make choices that will be in keeping with given situations. It is not to be deplored that he sometimes makes an unfortunate choice, for his personality and self-confidence grow as a result of the satisfactions he derives and the dissatisfactions he experiences.

From his playmates, teachers, and casual contacts with all kinds and varieties of people, the child learns essential lessons in human relationships and values. Such experiences combine with his home background to make the light and shade against which he must clarify his own criteria of worth and conduct.<sup>6</sup>

Routines are as essential in the home as in other places, and until the young child has established his behavior patterns, routines are highly significant, and there must be many of them. The problem of the home is not to

---

<sup>6</sup>Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg, "Authority and the Modern Parent," Child Study, XIII (March, 1936), 166, 188.

abandon routines, but to hold to them while lessening adult pressure in certain other matters, with the "deliberate intention of extending the child's responsibility for his own behavior."<sup>7</sup> Since emotional stability is dependent, especially in the young child, upon routines, the prevalence of routinized activities in the home is a kindness instead of a hardship, because the child thrives on the sense of security that comes from his being surrounded by familiar faces, rooms, possessions, and persons, and from his performance of familiar activities. Such a condition is restful to the nerves, whereas constant changes in surroundings and activities are often confusing and damaging to the young child's nervous stability. There is in the use of routines, however, a danger that the child's life will become so rigidly routinized that all initiative and freedom of choice on his part will be curtailed. Hence it is not routines as such, but their excessive use, that is to be guarded against.<sup>8</sup> Bacmeister believes that "security of routine and freedom of play are the foundations for success with the young child."<sup>9</sup> Thus there appears to be no discrepancy between a wholesome program of routines and a provision for independence in many other situations.

---

<sup>7</sup>May Hill Arbuthnot, "Transitions in Discipline," Childhood Education, XV (November, 1938), 102.

<sup>8</sup>Rhoda Bacmeister, "How Much Freedom for Children?," Parents Magazine, X (September, 1935), 56.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 57.

Routines, of course, are one effective means of discipline where the young child is concerned, but discipline assumes other forms as well, some of which are advantageous whereas others are unfortunate. True discipline is not found so much in the parents' teachings, in their elaborate programs of "do's" and "don'ts," or in their set-up of rewards and punishments, as in their day-by-day living with their children, in the way they share with their children their experiences and thoughts, their pleasures and hopes, and even their disappointments and defeats. Letting the children understand how adults arrive at decisions and how they balance and weigh values and potential outcomes in meeting situations and making choices will be more effective guides to the young than preachments, precepts, and disciplinary devices.<sup>10</sup> The child, as well as the adult, lives in an environment where problems arise and where choices must be made:

As a growing organism the child's first need is to live on a trial-and-error basis; he must be both sufficiently free and sufficiently protected to experiment with his own powers, with things, and with other people. Perhaps the major function of parental authority is to protect him from seriously injuring himself or others while giving him scope for this experimental living.

The ideal of growth demands that parents give the child every possible opportunity to become an individual who is both integrated within himself and adjusted to his environment. Mature parents know that

---

<sup>10</sup>Gruenberg, p. 188.

this ideal is never realized, but they know too that their child's chances of approximating it depend in large measure upon how they exercise their shared authority.<sup>11</sup>

Character itself implies the ability to make wise choices, and is developed solely by the practice of making choices, wise or foolish. Every parental order or ultimatum does away with free choice and means that the parents are inefficient as leaders and teachers. "An order," asserts Ellenwood, "is a retreat. It warps personality and stifles affection. It minimizes reason and cheapens democracy. If, for emergencies, it is kept around the house it should be labeled 'Poison.'"<sup>12</sup> Ellenwood believes that group discussion of an infraction of the group's principles, and group disapproval of the offense, are the best methods of causing the child to conform to those behavior patterns that are acceptable. If parents are often reluctant to give up their authority and to allow the child to have at least some measure of independence, it is often because of a lack of confidence in the child and in his ability to do what is best. At other times, the parents do not know how to be skillful counsellors; hence, to avoid the occurrence of problems with which they might not be able to cope successfully as advisers, they maintain an attitude and practice of

---

<sup>11</sup>Leonard Blumgart, "Partners in Authority," Child Study, XIII (March, 1936), 167.

<sup>12</sup>Ellenwood, pp. 49-50.

protectiveness which is an impairment to the child's best interests.<sup>13</sup>

In referring to the amount of independence that should be allowed a child, Bacmeister asserts:

Give him as much freedom as he can use to advantage. This does not mean as much as he can use wisely. If you give him only that much, you prevent him from learning by mistakes. He must have freedom to fail as well as to succeed, and must learn from both. But to give him more freedom than he can use either wisely or for learning is to his disadvantage, for if he chooses foolishly in a situation which he cannot understand, he fails to see the results of his action clearly and so learns nothing.<sup>14</sup>

Allingham, in pointing out the evils of over-protectiveness on the part of parents, relates a striking story. A fond mother, fearing for the safety of her little daughter as she went to school, always accompanied the child to a dangerous street intersection so as to make sure, herself, that no cars were coming; then she instructed the child to walk between the two white lines in the street and she would be safe. One morning the mother was unable to go with the child, but carefully instructed her to walk between the white lines. The child, having received no instruction in the thing that really mattered, did not look for cars and was seriously injured by an automobile. The parent who is too protective tends to look after important details himself and leaves his child unprepared to cope with a situation when the parent is not present. Allingham, indignant over

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 48-49.

<sup>14</sup>Bacmeister, p. 56.

the injustice done to children by over-protective parents, inquires:

Why do adults persist in trying to substitute their own intelligence and wisdom and abilities for those of the children in their care? Why do they persist in forcing these children to cling to their apron strings, in depriving them of their inalienable right to develop their own individual initiative and abilities? Why don't adults help children to grow up with a strong appreciation for independence in thought and behavior, for individually expressed, albeit socially approved, behavior?<sup>15</sup>

Negativism and timidity, two of the greatest hindrances to sociability in children, are among the results of "too much adult pressure, too complete regimentation, too little sense of the child's need to regulate his own behavior in some parts of the day."<sup>16</sup> The child must be permitted to learn how to achieve satisfaction as a result of his own initiative; instead of listlessly permitting the environment to do things to him, he must be encouraged to learn that he can do things to his environment for himself.<sup>17</sup> This is perhaps the most significant of all the discoveries that the young child can make.

Mothers sometimes reward their children for completely docile behavior, and gloat over perfect obedience, being unable to understand why some parents have so much trouble with obedience problems. But these children often cry and

---

<sup>15</sup>Bruce Allingham, "I Don't Want My Boy to Be a Rubber Stamp," Clearing House, XIII (February, 1939), 345.

<sup>16</sup>Arbuthnot, p. 102.

<sup>17</sup>Blumgart, p. 166.



are miserable and helpless when alone with other children. They are afraid to try anything because of their mothers' insistent prolongation of the submissiveness that naturally characterizes infancy. These mothers unwittingly are doing their children a grave injustice, for they are neglecting to prepare the way for the necessary transition in source of discipline -- from others to self.<sup>18</sup> The child is at a loss what to do if the voice of authority is momentarily stilled or absent.

Although an over-protective parental attitude is a serious handicap to the child, the parents' complete abdication from authority would react as unfavorably upon the child as stringent repression and oppression.<sup>19</sup> Apparently, every child is equipped with an inherent drive to achieve independence in thought and action; and a parent who tries to stifle this fundamental phase of human nature is doing violence to the child. Likewise, one who permits this drive to mature without wholesome guidance is shirking an important responsibility. That this innate tendency be "encouraged and developed and guided so that each child may become a wholesome, alert, well-balanced member of this complex society is an absolute necessity."<sup>20</sup> Once the question that most concerned the parents of young children was, "How

---

<sup>18</sup> Arbuthnot, p. 102.

<sup>19</sup> Blumgart, p. 166.

<sup>20</sup> Allingham, p. 345.

can I get unquestioning obedience?" Now, however, the emphasis is not so much on "making the child mind," but on this thought:

How can I best train my child so that he will make a responsible, happy, self-confident adult, capable of retaining his integrity in the face of temptations and difficulties and meeting successfully his obligations to his neighbors and to society.<sup>21</sup>

Despite this shift in emphasis, however, it is still too often true that

From the parental point of view, being well-behaved means essentially being like me, or at least, like my conception of what you should be. Small children rarely achieve this, and it is well. For if they did, it would be only at the price of giving up the immediate driving activities of childhood, namely, doing, learning, changing, exploring, experimenting, discovering.<sup>22</sup>

Even when the child enters school, he does not give up this delightful pattern of action; in fact, it is broadened and extended to include many other challenging things. The child has new worlds to conquer, and he is kept constantly busy with the "fresh adventure" of school, which utilizes his energies.

One of the chief functions of the modern school is a conscious attempt to provide an environment for the child that is cheerful and wholesome. Throughout the day the variegated activities are characterized by an atmosphere of friendliness. A definite effort is made to counteract some

---

<sup>21</sup>Larsen, p. 15.

<sup>22</sup>George D. Stoddard, "Adventures Toward Independence," Child Study, XIII (November, 1935), 42.

of the unfortunate effects of an unfavorable environment outside the school. The school teaches even the young child that he need not be totally subjected to his environment, but that he may rise above the unfavorable phases of it, and even be instrumental in producing an influence upon his environment.<sup>23</sup>

The function of the teacher in the schoolroom is neither that of a spectator nor that of an autocrat. The teacher, in brief, is a helper, guide, and adviser. All educators who have studied the problem agree that it is extremely difficult for the child suddenly to assume initiative at school if he has had no opportunity for demonstrating it at home. In former times it was not necessary to show initiative even at school, for the teacher merely continued in the schoolroom the autocracy that the child had become accustomed to at home. Now, however, the philosophy of the school has become, "Learn to do by doing." Unfortunately, in too many cases, that of the home is still, "Learn to do by obeying."<sup>24</sup> The child, of course, is tragically torn between the two conflicting philosophies; and in some cases the remarkable thing is not that he is slow to make adjustments to the school situations, but that he becomes in any manner adjusted to situations that are so drastically different

---

<sup>23</sup>Ridgley C. Clark, "Limitations of Freedom," Education, LVI (November, 1935), 178.

<sup>24</sup>Ruth Jourdonais, "Children Learn Through Managing Their Own Affairs," Educational Method, XVII (January, 1938), 180.

from anything that has occurred in the environment in and around his home.

It is tragic when parents and teachers are so distrustful of the child's ability that they "reduce him to dependence" and thus thwart him in his effort to overcome his ineptitudes and those of the parents and teachers. "Adult smugness must not rob the child of adventures in the discovery or rediscovery of pertinent knowledge or technique."<sup>25</sup>

The age period of six to twelve years is a time for the discovery of independence by an indirect route -- the route of learning, of doing, of mastering. The child may not know what it is all about, but if his natural tendencies are not inhibited by over-anxious adults, he will derive real joy from his little discoveries that are big to him. During this period the child begins to settle down, he undergoes emotional changes, and begins to do more for himself without adult help or supervision. He is ready to build upon the foundation of his earlier experiences and achieve an immeasurable extension of activity and interest. His parents are no longer the all-inclusive, all-powerful influences in his life; but if they have regarded him as an individual human personality, he will begin to respect them as guides and advisers.

In a sense the child is now too busy to be self-centered or so mother-father-centered. Or it may be

---

<sup>25</sup>Zirbes, p. 385.

said that his new emotional "scatter" permits a widening of his work-and-play horizon. No matter; he is, in these six years, barring unusual shocks, a doer and a learner of the first water, with an intensity of drive and a richness of new achievement never to be surpassed. Soon he will become an organizer and a social worker, even a social planner, from whom adults might learn much.<sup>26</sup>

Enough has been said to indicate clearly that independence in the home is conducive to sociability in the school, for freedom in family and neighborhood relationships will inevitably carry over into school situations. The independent child is, almost without exception, the socialized child, even before he ever sees the schoolroom. The child who is not allowed independence by his parents will not know how to conduct himself when he is placed among other children, for he will have had no experience in initiating for himself social contacts with those of his own age; and he will neither know how to approach his fellows nor how to have harmonious relationships with them. As a result, he is likely to be timid, retiring, and aloof, and sometimes even disdainful and proud. In short, he is not sociable because he does not know how to be; he has never been "on his own" before. Some children soon overcome these handicaps, but others never do.

The relation between independence and sociability has been adequately summarized by a professional educator, the father of a six-year-old son, as follows:

---

<sup>26</sup>Stoddard, p. 42.

I want Jimmy to be individual in his tastes for entertainment, companionship, methods of work, mannerisms -- all the thousand and one things which make for an independent nature. But I want him to have a certain social consciousness which will temper the rough edges of his independence and make him a balanced, wholesome individual, a socialized personality.<sup>27</sup>

### Related Studies

The writer has examined a number of studies that have some relation to the problem she has investigated, and in this portion of the chapter she proposes to summarize a few of these studies and to point out certain significant findings.

Little, who conducted a study of the problem of insecurity among children, made some very poignant observations on the seriousness of the lack of independence on the part of young children. She found that one of the most powerful causes of insecurity is the emotional disturbance produced in the child by the parents' attitude of over-protection. Mothers, especially, often continue to protect the child during the period when he should be learning the meaning of independent behavior, and do not realize that by so doing they are producing serious feelings of insecurity in the child. Over-protection produces frustration and helplessness when, for one reason or another, the protection is withdrawn and the child feels that his only support has gone. A little child entering school for the first time

---

<sup>27</sup> Allingham, p. 348.

often is separated from his mother, who has been his constant companion and protector. In most cases where the child is not familiar with the meaning of independence, he will cry, withdraw from the other children, and refuse to take part in the school activities. He will feel very disturbed and, if the teacher does not give him the much-wanted attention, he is likely to conclude that no one loves him.<sup>28</sup>

Little found that a parental attitude of over-protection often results in inefficiency and insecurity in the child that cause him to possess behavior patterns that cannot be accepted by society when he inevitably and eventually does have to meet the realities of life.<sup>29</sup> The mother who, in her desire to be a protector, believes everything her child tells her and enters into children's little quarrels in order to protect her own child, often causes the child to develop a cowardly attitude that impels him to run and tatttle for the least offense, knowing that his mother will take his part against the other children.<sup>30</sup>

In discussing further the effects of over-protection and of lack of independence, Little asserts that over-solicitude produces selfishness. When the child is self-centered, he will employ many undesirable tactics in order to

---

<sup>28</sup>Edith Little, "An Analysis of the Problem of the Insecurity of Children" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1939), p. 9.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

get his way. The child who is the victim of over-protection has a difficult time when he must face realities alone. He often does not like school because there he cannot have so much attention, nor can he have his way so freely, as at home.<sup>31</sup>

Little found that a lack of ability to play games as other children do is often detrimental to social adjustment. If a child is not permitted to play and to make social contacts in his preschool years, he likely will not know how to make friends and how to get along with people. When he has to leave his mother, he may be expected to have many lonesome and unhappy hours.<sup>32</sup> That lack of independence is detrimental to the child's personality, thwarts his ambitions, and curbs his aptitudes, was a conclusion arrived at by Little in her study of the insecurity of children.<sup>33</sup>

Manwell, in an investigation of the social development of the child, found that three primary factors contribute to a child's non-sociability: (1) he feels inadequate in social relations because of previous social failures or criticisms, because of lack of knowledge of what is accepted or expected, because of various feelings of inferiority, because of extremely high standards demanded by adults, and because of teasing, bullying, and dominating tendencies on the part of his associates; (2) he fears the

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 31.



unfamiliar because of undue demonstration and affectionate fondling by his parents, which resulted in a reluctance to try anything new, because of sad or unfortunate experiences with the unfamiliar in the past, because of feelings of insecurity even with the familiar, and because of feelings of physical or social inability to cope with new situations due to lack of experience with novel and unfamiliar things;

(3) he desires to maintain his infantile comfort and security and to protect himself from rebuffs, criticisms, appraisal, or ridicule -- an attitude brought about, in the main, by over-indulgence on the part of the parents or nurse, or by harsh or neglectful parents or nurse.<sup>34</sup>

Manwell concluded the results of over-protection and over-indulgence to be:

. . . a timid and passive or an overbearing child;  
 a child who loses his head when adult freedom comes;  
 a child who is antagonistic, sullen, or secretive;  
 a child who seeks to fasten the blame on others.<sup>35</sup>

Capps conducted a study on three phases of student progress in the elementary school as influenced by the regular employment of mothers. Although the main body of the study is not intimately connected with the present investigation, portions of it are related to independence and sociability. The results of the study, for instance, point to the fact that the out-of-home employment of the mother

---

<sup>34</sup>Elizabeth Moore Manwell, The Social Development of the Child, p. 50.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 90.

is not necessarily detrimental to the welfare of the child; as a matter of fact, it may, within certain limitations, develop qualities that are advantageous and beneficial to him. Children who are removed from the over-protectiveness of their parents usually demonstrate their sense of insecurity by creating a number of behavior problems or by exhibiting various forms of anti-social behavior.<sup>36</sup>

Francis and Fillmore, after conducting an investigation of the influence of environment upon the personality of children, arrived at the following conclusions that are pertinent to the present study:

It appears that the attitudes of the parents rather than physical environment are of major importance in influencing the development of personality in the child. Even though health of parents and condition of home are listed under physical environment, they may more truly be considered as contributing to or a part of attitudes. . . . Since parent attitudes are the decisive factor, parents must themselves be adjusted and have an intelligent interest in the child's welfare in order to further the child's development along helpful lines. . . . The main point . . . is that parental attitudes do shape the personality of a child, while his material surroundings are not of vital importance.<sup>37</sup>

To establish the last statement quoted above, the authors cited examples of poor children who had known independence in their homes who were popular at school, and well-to-do

---

<sup>36</sup>Maud Capps, "The Effect of Regular Employment of Mothers on Three Phases of Student Progress in the Elementary School" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1938), p. 37.

<sup>37</sup>Kenneth V. Francis and Eva A. Fillmore, The Influence of Environment upon the Personality of Children, p. 43.

ones who had been over-protected in their homes and who were snobs at school and highly unpopular among their associates.

### CHAPTER III

#### ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT BEHAVIOR AMONG THE FIRST-GRADE CHILDREN IN THEIR HOME ENVIRONMENT AND OF THEIR SOCIAL SUCCESS IN SCHOOL SITUATIONS

As has been explained in the first chapter of this thesis, the writer has confined her report of her investigation of independent behavior in home situations to the fifty members of her first-grade classes for whom she had complete records for all items included in this investigation. She regrets, however, that of the fifty children included in the independence survey, only twenty-one possessed records of their social success in school situations that were sufficiently complete to warrant their being included in the second portion of this study. This fact has necessarily placed regrettable limitations upon the possible outcomes of the study as reported in these pages. The number of children participating in the study of independence seems to be adequate, and an analysis of the twenty-one pupils contributing to the investigation of social success tends to indicate certain definite trends, as will be pointed out in the course of this report.

In the present chapter the writer proposes to present an analysis of the amount of independent behavior permitted the children in their homes, the home duties and responsibilities of the children, the physical and esthetic abilities of the children, parental attitudes toward certain factors related to the independent behavior of their children, and the social success of the pupils in certain situations in their school life.

#### Independence in the Home

One of the primary objects of this study was the discovery of the extent to which the first-grade children were permitted to practice independent behavior in their homes. To obtain data for her investigation, the writer conducted personal interviews with the parents of each of the children. She had previously worded her questions in such a way that each one could be answered by a simple "yes" or "no" on the part of the parents. The writer has carefully reorganized the questions on the basis of the topics to be discussed in the present chapter. The data for the children's independent behavior in the home are shown in Table 1, in which the questions have been numbered for greater convenience in referring to them in the discussion.

The number of "yes" answers, as revealed in the table, ranged from seven for questions one and two to forty-eight for question eight, or from 14.0 to 96.0 per cent, respectively. The number of "no" answers ranged from two for

question eight to forty-three for questions one and two, or from 4.0 to 86.0 per cent, respectively. The table indicates that only seven of the fifty children were given an allowance; each of them, however, was permitted to spend his allowance as he wished. Questions one and two, then, reveal that the fifty first-grade children had little opportunity to exercise independence in the matter of handling and using money. A commendable amount of independence, however, was discovered in the choice of clothing and friends, as indicated in questions three and four in the table.

Forty-one, or 82.0 per cent, of the children were permitted to have at least some voice in the choice of their clothing, but nine (18.0 per cent) were allowed no opportunity whatever to participate in the choice of their clothing. Forty-four of the pupils (88.0 per cent) were allowed to choose their own friends and to bring them to their homes without any objections or interference on the part of their parents; but six (12.0 per cent) were denied this privilege altogether.

In the manner in which it is stated in the table, question five, when answered "yes," carries a negative implication so far as independence is concerned. Thirty-six, or 72.0 per cent, of the children were required to come into the house at a certain time in the evenings, whereas fourteen, or 28.0 per cent, were not required to do so. This means, then, that only approximately one-fourth of the children had opportunity to be independent in the matter of

coming into the house in the evenings. Question six is also negatively stated, and a positive answer of "yes" carries an implication of the absence of independence. Twenty-two (44.0 per cent) of the children were required to go to bed at a certain time every night, but twenty-eight (56.0 per cent) did not have to conform to such a requirement. Thus the children were rather equally divided in relation to their being permitted or refused independence in deciding when they would retire in the evenings.

A high degree of independence is limned in question seven, the responses to which indicated that forty-four (88.0 per cent) of the pupils could eat anything that other members of their families consumed; only four (8.0 per cent) were denied this privilege. The records of two of the children omitted an answer to this particular question.

Questions eight and nine are negatively stated and, as answered by the parents, do not indicate much opportunity for independence. Forty-eight (96.0 per cent) of the fifty children were required to "come straight home" each afternoon after the dismissal of school, whereas only two (4.0 per cent) were allowed any deviation from this requirement. Forty-three (86.0 per cent) of the pupils were required to attend Sunday School every Sunday that they were able to do so, and only seven (14.0 per cent) were permitted any choice in the matter. Question ten reveals that only fourteen children (28.0 per cent) were permitted to attend the

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF THE FIFTY FIRST-GRADE PUPILS  
WHO WERE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE CERTAIN TRAITS OF  
INDEPENDENCE, ACCORDING TO PARENTS' ANSWERS  
TO CERTAIN QUESTIONS

Questions	Parents' Answers			
	Yes		No	
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent
1. Is the child given an allowance?.....	7	14.0	43	86.0
2. Is he allowed to spend his allowance as he chooses?.....	7	14.0	43	86.0
3. Does he have a part in choosing his own clothes?.....	41	82.0	9	18.0
4. Is he allowed to choose any friends he likes and to bring them to his home?.....	44	88.0	6	12.0
5. Must he come in the house at a cer- tain time in the evenings?.....	36	72.0	14	28.0
6. Must he go to bed at a certain time every evening?.....	22	44.0	28	56.0
7. May he eat anything the family eats?.	44	88.0	4	8.0
8. Must he come straight home after school?.....	48	96.0	2	4.0
9. Is he required to attend Sunday School every Sunday he is able?....	43	86.0	7	14.0
10. May he go to the Saturday morning movie alone?.....	14	28.0	36	72.0
11. Is he often sent on errands to the store or to the neighbors'?.....	35	70.0	15	30.0
12. Does the child exhibit marked fears of any kind?.....	19	38.0	31	62.0
13. Does he like to go to school?.....	47	94.0	3	6.0



Saturday morning "kiddie" movie unaccompanied; hence only slightly more than one-fourth of them were allowed independence in this connection.

Thirty-five (70.0 per cent) of the pupils were often sent on errands to stores or the homes of neighbors, and were thus trusted to accomplish missions that were undoubtedly conducive to independence in behavior. Fifteen (30.0 per cent) of the children were not permitted to perform such errands. Nineteen, or 38.0 per cent, of the children were reported by their parents to possess fears of one kind or another, but thirty-one (62.0 per cent) were thought to be free from such fears. In the matter of school attendance, forty-seven (94.0 per cent) of the pupils were believed by their parents to enjoy going to school. Whether such an attitude was actually a true picture of the situation, or whether the parents were merely giving the answer that they felt would please the writer, is unknown, of course, and the reader may feel free to place his own interpretation upon the item. If such a large number of the children did attend school through voluntary choice and not because of the promptings of parents or the strictures of the compulsory attendance law, they were thus depicted as enjoying school through independent choice.

### Home Duties and Responsibilities

Included in the questionnaire which formed the basis of the writer's interviews with the parents of the first-grade children were three questions designed to reveal the extent to which these beginning pupils were assigned definite duties and responsibilities in and around their homes. The data relevant to this portion of the study are presented in Table 2. It was assumed that the extent to which the children were charged with home duties and responsibilities would provide an index to the manner in which they were permitted to exercise independent behavior. Of course, the assignment of duties and responsibilities to the children in the home implies the imposition of a certain amount of parental authority, but the performance of the tasks provides an opportunity for independent action and for the development of initiative. For this reason, assigned tasks are looked upon as a gauge of parental willingness to permit independent behavior on the part of their children.

In all three classes of duties and responsibilities listed in Table 2, more children were allowed independence than were denied it. Thirty (60.0 per cent) of the pupils helped with the dishes, and twenty (40.0 per cent) did not; thirty-eight (76.0 per cent) assisted in the care of the yard, whereas twelve (24.0 per cent) did not do so; and thirty (60.0 per cent) of the children were assigned certain

TABLE 2

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES ASSUMED BY THE FIFTY  
FIRST-GRADE CHILDREN IN THEIR HOMES, AS  
INDICATED IN INTERVIEWS WITH  
THEIR PARENTS

Questions	Parents' Answers			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1. Does your child help with the dishes?..	30	60.0	20	40.0
2. Does he help with the yard?.....	38	76.0	12	24.0
3. Does he have other chores in the home?.....	30	60.0	20	40.0

miscellaneous chores and responsibilities not contained in the first two items in the table. Twenty (40.0 per cent) did not have any miscellaneous duties. Hence the number of pupils who were permitted to exercise independence in the matter of home duties and responsibilities ranged from thirty to thirty-eight, and the number who were denied independent behavior ranged from twelve to twenty.

#### Physical and Esthetic Abilities

Proficiency in the performance of physical and esthetic activities was looked upon by the writer as indicative of

independent behavior insofar as the parents permitted their children to engage in such activities, thus aiding in the development of skill and initiative. Table 3 presents the answers of the parents to the items in the questionnaire relating to the children's physical and esthetic abilities.

The first division of the table, as indicated in the stub, deals with physical skills, and the second, with esthetic accomplishments. It is readily seen that the number of "yes" answers pertaining to physical skills ranged from four to forty-three, or from 8.0 to 86.0 per cent. Forty-three (86.0 per cent) of the children were successful in riding tricycles, whereas seven (14.0 per cent) had not attained this skill. Ten (20.0 per cent) of them could ride a bicycle with a fair degree of skill, but forty (80.0 per cent) could not do so. Seventeen (34.0 per cent) were successful with roller skates, but thirty-three (66.0 per cent) were not. Eleven (22.0 per cent) were proficient at baseball, but thirty-nine (78.0 per cent) were not. Only four could swim, whereas forty-six could not. This, however, was not surprising, considering the youth of the pupils. Greater cause for surprise would have been found had a larger number been able to swim. It is interesting to note that in only one physical skill, that of tricycle riding, were as many as half of the children fairly successful.

In connection with esthetic achievements, in only two

TABLE 3

PHYSICAL AND ESTHETIC ABILITIES OF THE FIFTY FIRST-  
GRADE CHILDREN, AS INDICATED IN INTERVIEWS  
WITH THEIR PARENTS

Questions	Parents' Answers			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Does your child perform in the following sports, games, and skills with a fair degree of success?				
1. Riding tricycle..	43	86.0	7	14.0
2. Riding bicycle...	10	20.0	40	80.0
3. Roller skating...	17	34.0	33	66.0
4. Baseball.....	11	22.0	39	78.0
5. Swimming.....	4	8.0	46	92.0
Does your child show a fair degree of success in the following achievements?				
1. Drawing or art...	31	62.0	19	38.0
2. Singing.....	28	56.0	22	44.0
3. Speaking before group.....	24	48.0	26	52.0
4. Play-acting.....	17	34.0	33	66.0
5. Dancing.....	20	40.0	30	60.0

of the five cases were more "yes" answers received than "no" answers. Thirty-one (62.0 per cent) of the pupils had attained a fair degree of success in drawing or art, but nineteen (38.0 per cent) had failed to attain success in this particular aptitude. Twenty-eight (56.0 per cent) could sing rather well, but twenty-two (44.0 per cent) could not. Twenty-four (48.0 per cent) were able to speak before a group with a fair degree of success, whereas twenty-six (52.0 per cent) could not successfully do so. Only seventeen (34.0 per cent) were fairly proficient in play-acting, but thirty-three (66.0 per cent) could not be said to have attained success in this line. Twenty (40.0 per cent) could dance rather successfully, whereas thirty (60.0 per cent) could not do so. It is readily apparent that, in connection with both physical and esthetic abilities, most of the children had attained neither proficiency nor independence. In all probability, however, the average level of accomplishment was as high as that of any similar group of pupils.

#### Parents' Attitudes Toward Independence

Undoubtedly, the attitudes of parents toward the question of whether a child should be permitted to exercise independence in his behavior has much to do with the amount and type of independent behavior in which the child engages. For this reason the writer was interested in discovering what attitudes prevailed among the parents of the first-grade

children included in this study with relation to certain aspects of independent behavior on the part of their children. The results of the interviews in this connection are shown in Table 4.

Thirty-seven (74.0 per cent) of the parents declared that children should obey their parents in everything all the time, and only thirteen (26.0 per cent) expressed a willingness to be more lenient by answering "no" to question one in Table 4. A somewhat more liberal, and in some ways inconsistent, attitude is expressed in question two, in which six (12.0 per cent) parents maintained that children should be whipped or spanked every time they fail to obey their parents, and in which forty-four (88.0 per cent) parents were willing to report "no" for this item. Forty-five, or 90.0 per cent, of the parents interviewed believed that children should never be allowed to violate the expressed wishes of their parents and "get away with it." Five (10.0 per cent) of the parents were liberal enough to say that children should sometimes be allowed to violate their parents' expressed wishes. Twelve (24.0 per cent) of the parents reported having, at one time or other, requested that their children be excused from participation in certain activities because of poor health, and thirty-eight (76.0 per cent) answered "no" to the question. Most of the parents, thirty-seven, or 74.0 per cent, admitted having, at times, forbidden their children to play with other children in the

TABLE 4

PARENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CERTAIN FACTORS RELATED  
TO THEIR CHILDREN'S INDEPENDENT BEHAVIOR, AS  
DETERMINED BY INTERVIEW

Questions	Parents' Answers			
	Yes		No	
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent
1. Do you think children should obey their parents in everything all the time?.....	37	74.0	13	26.0
2. Do you think children should be whipped or spanked every time they fail to obey their parents?.....	6	12.0	44	88.0
3. Do you believe children should sometimes be allowed to violate the expressed wishes of their parents and "get away with it"?.....	5	10.0	45	90.0
4. Do you sometimes request that your child be excused from school or church activities on account of poor health?.....	12	24.0	38	76.0
5. Have you ever forbidden your child to play with other children in the neighborhood because they were too rough, they used bad language, or they were too dirty?.....	37	74.0	13	26.0
6. Does your child seem to have a marked preference for one parent over the other?.....	11	22.0	39	78.0
7. On the whole, do you believe your child had rather go to school than to stay at home?.....	43	86.0	7	14.0



neighborhood because they were too rough, they used bad language, or they were too dirty. Thirteen (26.0 per cent) had never placed such restrictions upon the activities of their children. Eleven (22.0 per cent) of the parents indicated that their children seemed to have a marked preference for one parent in comparison with the other; thirty-nine (78.0 per cent), however, had noticed no apparent parental preferences on the part of their children. Question seven seems to indicate a slight inconsistency with question thirteen of Table 1, in which forty-seven of the fifty pupils were reported as liking to go to school. In Table 4, however, forty-three (86.0 per cent) of the parents indicated a belief that their children had rather attend school than to stay at home, whereas seven (14.0 per cent) felt that their children would prefer remaining at home. Perhaps this seeming inconsistency can be explained by stating that the children in question possibly did enjoy going to school, but that they would prefer to remain at home. Hence their enjoyment of their homes did not necessarily supplant their previously reported enjoyment of school, but their enjoyment of home and of school seemed to be a thing of degree. Only in two of the seven parental attitudes listed in Table 4 was any appreciable liberality of opinion expressed that would tend to encourage independent behavior on the part of the children in the first grade. The instances in which this liberality occurred

are shown in questions two and seven, and pertain to corporal punishment and to school attendance. In all of the other instances the prevailing attitude was one that would not tend to encourage or foster independence.

#### Quartiles of Independent Behavior

The writer, wishing to present a concise summary of the status of independent behavior among her first-grade pupils in their home environments, has compiled Table 5 in an effort to show the actual extent to which the children were permitted to exercise independence in and around their homes. In connection with the realization of this object, the pupils were divided into quartiles on the basis of the number of situations in which they exhibited independent behavior. The twenty-six situations referred to in Table 5 are those appearing as sub-divisions in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Each of the situations was carefully analyzed on the basis of the number of pupils who entered into it with evidences of independent behavior, and the resulting tabulations were arranged in the quartiles that appear in the table. Included in the fourth quartile are those pupils who possessed the highest degree of independent behavior in home situations, and the other quartiles are arranged in descending order.

In the fourth quartile the range of independence was from nineteen, or 73.0 per cent, of the twenty-six situations,

TABLE 5

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF TWENTY-SIX SITUATIONS IN WHICH  
EACH FIRST-GRADE PUPIL POSSESSED OR LACKED  
INDEPENDENT BEHAVIOR IN HIS HOME

Pupil Number	Possession of Independent Behavior		Lack of Independent Behavior	
	Situations		Situations	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Fourth Quartile				
45....	19	73.0	7	26.9
28....	17	65.3	9	34.6
24....	17	65.3	9	34.6
30....	17	65.3	9	34.6
35....	17	65.3	9	34.6
6....	17	65.3	9	34.6
47....	17	65.3	9	34.6
48....	16	61.5	10	38.4
20....	16	61.5	10	38.4
38....	15	57.6	11	42.3
31....	15	57.6	11	42.3
8....	15	57.6	11	42.3
51....	14	53.8	12	46.1
Average	16.3	62.6	9.7	37.2
Third Quartile				
32....	14	53.8	12	46.1
46....	14	53.8	12	46.1
25....	14	53.8	12	46.1
44....	13	50.0	13	50.0
2....	13	50.0	13	50.0
26....	13	50.0	13	50.0
13....	13	50.0	13	50.0
19....	13	50.0	13	50.0
50....	13	50.0	13	50.0
37....	12	46.1	14	53.8
49....	12	46.1	14	53.8
34....	12	46.1	14	53.8
Average	13.0	49.9	13.0	49.9

TABLE 5 -- Continued

Pupil Number	Possession of Independent Behavior		Lack of Independent Behavior	
	Situations		Situations	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Second Quartile				
33....	12	46.1	14	53.8
9....	12	46.1	14	53.8
3....	12	46.1	14	53.8
43....	12	46.1	14	53.8
21....	12	46.1	14	53.8
40....	11	44.0	14	56.0
27....	11	42.3	15	57.6
23....	11	42.3	15	57.6
22....	11	42.3	15	57.6
12....	11	42.3	15	57.6
5....	11	42.3	15	57.6
14....	11	42.3	15	57.6
Average	11.4	44.0	14.5	55.9
First Quartile				
10....	11	42.3	15	57.6
18....	11	42.3	15	57.6
29....	11	42.3	15	57.6
39....	10	40.0	15	60.0
42....	10	38.4	16	61.5
1....	10	38.4	16	61.5
11....	10	38.4	16	61.5
4....	8	30.7	18	69.2
17....	8	30.7	18	69.2
36....	8	30.7	18	69.2
41....	7	26.9	19	73.0
16....	7	26.9	19	73.0
7....	7	26.9	19	73.0
Average	9.0	35.0	16.8	64.9

to fourteen, or 53.8 per cent. Each pupil in this quartile was independent in an average of 16.3 of the twenty-six situations, or in 62.6 per cent of the total number. On the other hand, each pupil lacked independence in 9.7 of the situations, or in 37.2 per cent of the total.

The degree of independence in the third quartile ranged from fourteen situations (53.8 per cent) to twelve situations (46.1 per cent). Each pupil in this group was independent in an average of thirteen situations, or 49.9 per cent of the total. In the third quartile, the average number of situations in which the pupils possessed independence and the average number of situations in which they lacked it were equal.

The second quartile presented a range in independent behavior from twelve (46.1 per cent) situations to eleven (42.3 per cent) situations. Each pupil in this quartile possessed independence in an average of 11.4 situations, or 44.0 per cent of the total. In this quartile the average number of situations in which the pupils lacked independence exceeded the average number of situations in which they possessed independence.

In the lowest, or first, quartile, the number of situations in which independence was exhibited ranged from eleven (42.3 per cent) to seven (26.9 per cent). Each pupil possessed independence in nine of the situations, on an average, or in 35.0 per cent of the total. In contrast, he

lacked independence in an average of 16.8 situations, or 64.9 per cent of the total.

The table shows that the range of independence among the fifty first-grade pupils was from 73.0 per cent to 35.0 per cent of the total twenty-six situations under consideration. In the two upper quartiles, independence was exhibited in an average of fifty per cent of the situations, or more; whereas in the two lower quartiles, independence was shown to exist in an average of less than fifty per cent of the situations.

#### Social Success in School

In determining the social success of pupils in school situations, the writer took advantage of a system of pupil choices that had been inaugurated in her classes, for she believed that such a procedure would provide as accurate an index to a child's popularity as it would be possible to obtain. It was the custom in the first-grade classes to select room nurses and dentists to conduct a daily health inspection of the pupils, play leaders for the outdoor play periods, and birthday kings and queens to preside over the monthly birthday parties held in the room. The selections were always made by pupil choices, reported secretly to the teacher by the individual children. Each pupil reported a first, second, and third choice for the position for which persons were being nominated. The winner in each case was

the child who received the largest number of points. The point system employed by the writer was very simple: three points were allowed for a first choice, two points for a second choice, and one point for a third choice. Hence the nurses, dentists, play leaders, kings and queens, and others, were named as a result of a simple mathematical calculation by the teacher, involving multiplication and addition of points. Since it was believed by the writer that the number of points a child received as a result of the pupil choices was an indication of his popularity among his fellows, this choice-and-point system was utilized to determine the pupils' social success in the school situations mentioned above. As has been previously explained, only twenty-one pupils had records that were sufficiently complete to permit their use in the present analysis. The writer possessed choice points for more than twenty-one children, but only twenty-one had records that were adequate in the three main investigations of this study, namely, degree of independence in home situations, intelligence scores, and points derived from pupil choices.

Table 6 presents the social-success points for the twenty-one pupils with records that were complete in all details. The points that appear in the table pertain to pupil choices for positions of social responsibility in the first grade, including room nurse, room dentist, play leader, and birthday king and queen. The pupils are arranged in

TABLE 6

SOCIAL SUCCESS OF FIRST-GRADE PUPILS IN SCHOOL  
SITUATIONS, INDICATED BY PUPIL CHOICES FOR  
POSITIONS OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY,  
AND ARRANGED IN DESCENDING ORDER

Pupil Number	Social Success (In Points)
37 . . . . .	89
5 . . . . .	79
6 . . . . .	48
12 . . . . .	46
13 . . . . .	45
2 . . . . .	37
14 . . . . .	37
31 . . . . .	31
7 . . . . .	29
8 . . . . .	26
3 . . . . .	25
9 . . . . .	21
22 . . . . .	19
16 . . . . .	18
18 . . . . .	17
17 . . . . .	15
21 . . . . .	15
1 . . . . .	10
11 . . . . .	5
10 . . . . .	3
Average, quartile 4 .	61.4
Average, quartile 3 .	32.0
Average, quartile 2 .	20.0
Average, quartile 1 .	9.6

quartiles based upon their social-success points. The fourth and third quartiles are the two upper quartiles, and contain, in descending order, those pupils with the highest social-success scores. The second first are the two lower quartiles, and consist of the pupils with the lowest social-success scores, arranged in descending order. The average



number of social-success points for each quartile has been computed.

A cursory examination of the table reveals at a glance that the average social-success score ranged from 9.6 points to 61.4 points, whereas the individual scores ranged from zero to eighty-nine points. A more detailed study of the table indicates that, for the highest quartile, the individual social-success scores ranged from forty-five to eighty-nine points, with an average for this quartile of 61.4 points. The pupils in the third quartile, on the other hand, presented a point range that extended from twenty-six to thirty-seven points, with an average of thirty-two points. In the second quartile the range was from seventeen to twenty-five points, representing an average of twenty points. The lowest quartile had a range in points from three to fifteen, with an average of 9.6 points.

It is readily seen that the twenty-one pupils included in this portion of the study exhibited extremely wide variations in connection with their social success in certain school situations. These data, together with the other findings analyzed in the present chapter, will be summarized briefly in the succeeding chapter in an effort to discover whether any significant relationships existed.

#### Summary

It seems desirable at this point to present a brief summary of the findings of this study thus far. In this

connection, the writer believes that the following concise statements will serve to define the most significant results thus far discovered:

1. The children were provided with little opportunity to handle and use money of their own.

2. They were given a wide range of independence in the selection of their friends and of their clothing.

3. Most of the children were not allowed independence in the matter of a time for coming into the house in the evenings. Almost of them, however, were allowed some voice in deciding when they should retire at night.

4. Most of the children were permitted to eat anything that other members of the family ate.

5. Little independence was permitted in the matters of coming home immediately after school and of attending Sunday School. The same was true with regard to attending the Saturday morning "kiddie" movie alone.

6. Almost two-thirds of the children were frequently sent on errands which undoubtedly were conducive to independent behavior.

7. Almost all of the children enjoyed going to school.

8. On the whole, the children were allowed considerable independence in the performance of certain duties and responsibilities in and around their homes.

9. Concerning physical and esthetic abilities, most of the children had attained neither proficiency nor independence.

10. In the main, the parents' attitudes toward the desirability of independent behavior on the part of their children were not such as would encourage a manifestation of such independence.

11. In twenty-six situations under consideration in this study, in which independent behavior was possible in the homes, such behavior ranged from 35.0 to 73.0 per cent of the situations.

12. Social-success scores for the pupils in school situations presented exceedingly wide variations.

## CHAPTER IV

### INDEPENDENCE, INTELLIGENCE, AND SOCIAL STATUS

Table 7 shows that there were forty-eight children in the independence tests and in the intelligence quotients. There were scores for only sixteen of the forty-eight children in the social status test. The quartile arrangement of the scores was ranked up on the basis of the independence scores.

TABLE 7

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PUPILS' INDEPENDENCE SCORES,  
INTELLIGENCE SCORES, AND SOCIAL STATUS SCORES AS  
SHOWN BY A COMPARISON OF THE PERSONNEL  
OF THE QUARTILES

Quar- tile Range	Independence Test		Intelligence Quotients		Social Status Test	
	No. of Children	Average Score	No. of Children	Average Score	No. of Children	Average Score
4...	12	7.5	12	105.83	3	3.0
3...	12	-0.25	12	104.34	4	0.82
2...	12	-3.5	12	93.08	5	3.54
1...	12	-9.33	12	99.90	4	3.5

Reading from left to right in quartile four there are twelve children with average independence scores of 7.5 and the same children have average intelligence quotients of 105.83. There were scores available for three of the children in this group in the social status test. The average score for the social status test was 3.0. Similar information is shown for the other quartiles.

Close observation of the table shows that there is very little relationship between any of the average scores and the degree of independence. It is apparent, however, that the children who have the higher intelligence quotients also have the higher scores in their independence and an average score in social status. Four of the twelve pupils in the first quartile made higher social status scores than the more intelligent children. The children in quartile three who have an average intelligence quotient of 104.34 have the lowest social status score of 0.82.

The Pearson Product Moment correlation formula was applied to the independence scores and to the other measures. The coefficient of correlation between the independence and intelligence quotients showed a correlation of  $.24 \pm .109$ . The correlation between the independence and social status scores showed a negative correlation of  $-.36 \pm .146$ . The social status and intelligence quotients showed a negative

correlation of  $-.138 \pm .245$ . None of these correlations can be considered significant. It is surprising, however, that the results show a fair-sized negative correlation between independence and social status scores. All that this can mean is that there is a slight tendency for those children who are allowed more than average freedom by their parents to develop the kind of personal traits which are not conducive to social acceptance. As stated before, the children in the study represent practically every economic level of family life, and it may be that some of the extra freedom for some of the children was actually neglect on the part of the parents. It is probable that the children who were neglected developed personality characteristics not wholly acceptable to the social group in many activities.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Conclusions

The writer believes that the following statements will serve to present, by way of summary and conclusion, the principal findings disclosed by her investigation:

1. The first-grade children participating in the study were provided with little opportunity to handle and use money of their own.
2. They were given a wide range of independence in the selection of their friends and of their clothing.
3. Most of the children were not allowed independence in the matter of choosing a time for coming into the house in the evenings. Almost half of them, however, were allowed some voice in deciding what their bedtime should be.
4. Most of the children were permitted to eat anything that other members of their families ate.
5. Little independence was permitted in the matters of coming home immediately after school and of attending Sunday School. The same was true with regard to attending the Saturday morning "kiddie" movie alone.

6. Almost two-thirds of the children were frequently sent on errands which undoubtedly were conducive to independent behavior.

7. Almost all of the children enjoyed going to school.

8. On the whole, the children were allowed considerable independence in the performance of certain duties and responsibilities in and around the home.

9. Concerning physical and esthetic abilities, most of the children had attained neither proficiency nor independence, although their level of attainment was perhaps in keeping with that of similar groups of children of first-grade level.

10. In the main, the parents' attitudes toward the desirability of independent behavior on the part of their children were not such as would encourage a manifestation of such independence.

11. In twenty-six situations under consideration in this study, in which independent behavior was possible in the homes, such behavior ranged from thirty-five to seventy-three per cent of the situations.

12. Social-success scores for the pupils in school situations presented exceedingly wide variations.

#### Recommendations

On the basis of her study, the writer feels that the following recommendations are worthy of consideration:



1. Since an analysis of the correlations indicated that those children who were permitted independence in the home to a greater degree than were the others tended to have conduct that was less socially acceptable at school, it would be advisable for parents to see to it that their children's freedom in the home is not the result of parental neglect or indifference, since these traits tend to develop personalities in young children that are not socially acceptable. Parents should permit their children to have a reasonable degree of independence, but it should be wisely guided and directed.

2. Other studies should be conducted along lines similar to the present investigation, so that ultimately certain definite and conclusive trends can be established as a result of extensive study.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allingham, Bruce, "I Don't Want My Boy to Be A Rubber Stamp," Clearing House, XIII (February, 1939), 345-348.
- Arbuthnot, May Hill, "Transitions in Discipline," Childhood Education, XV (November, 1938), 101-107.
- Bacmeister, Rhoda, "How Much Freedom for Children?," Parents Magazine, X (September, 1935), 18-19, 56-59.
- Blumgart, Leonard, "Partners in Authority," Child Study, XIII (March, 1936), 165-167.
- Capps, Maud, "The Effect of Regular Employment of Mothers on Three Phases of Student Progress in the Elementary School," Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1938.
- Clark, Ridgley C., "Limitations of Freedom," Education, LVI (November, 1935), 175-179.
- Ellenwood, James Lee, "Are You a Dictator?," Parents Magazine, XIII (November, 1938), 16-17.
- Francis, Kenneth V. and Fillmore, Eva A., The Influence of Environment upon the Personality of Children, University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, IX, No. 2, Iowa City, University Press, 1934.
- Gruenberg, Sidonie Matsner, "Authority and the Modern Parent," Child Study, XIII (March, 1936), 163-165, 188.
- Jourdonais, Ruth, "Children Learn Through Managing Their Own Affairs," Educational Method, XVII (January, 1938), 176-180.
- Larsen, June S., "How Much Obedience?," Parents Magazine, X (April, 1935), 15.
- Little, Edith, "An Analysis of the Problem of Insecurity of Children," Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1939.

Manwell, Elizabeth Moore, The Social Development of the Child, Washington, American Association of University Women, 1934.

Patrick, Flora LaRue, "The Relation Between the Sociability of Parents and the Social Success of Their Children in School," Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1940.

Rogers, Roberta, "Certain Ideas of Child-Parent Companionship as Expressed by Second-Grade Pupils in the Sam Houston School, Denton, Texas," Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, 1940.

Stoddard, George D., "Adventures Toward Independence," Child Study, XIII (November, 1935), 41-43.

Zirbes, Laura, "What Is 'Freedom' in the Classroom?," Progressive Education, XI (November, 1934), 383-385.